	Case 3:08-cv-01016-JM-BLM	Document 4	Filed 06/19/2008	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	SOUTHE	ERN DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORN	NIA	
10	MADIZ COOTT	ı	CASE NO. 00	1016 IM(DLM)	
11 12	MARK SCOTT	Dlointiff		ev1016 JM(BLM)	
13	vs.	Plaintiff,		NTING MOTION TO FORMA PAUPERIS;	
13	THE VESSEL ORION			NT OF COUNSEL	
15		Defendant.			
16	On or about June 6, 2008 Plaintiff commenced this <u>in rem</u> action alleging that the vessel Orion failed to compensate him for services rendered. Plaintiff also moves for leave of court to proceed <u>in</u>				
17					
18	forma pauperis and for appointment of counsel.				
19	Plaintiff declares that he is not currently employed, has no significant assets, and receives monthly disability payments. Accordingly, Plaintiff is an individual entitled to prosecute this action without the prepayment of fees. See 28 U.S.C. §1915.				
20					
21					
22					
23	The Motion for Appointment of Counsel Plaintiff requests the appointment of counsel to assist him in prosecuting this civil action. The				
24	Constitution provides no right to appointment of counsel in a civil case unless an indigent litigant may lose his physical liberty if he loses the litigation. <u>Lassiter v. Dept. of Social Services</u> , 452 U.S. 18, 25				
25					
26	(1981). Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), however, district courts are granted discretion to appoint				
27	counsel for indigent persons under "exceptional circumstances." <u>Terrell v. Brewer</u> , 935 F.2d 1015,				
28	1017 (9th Cir. 1991). "A finding	g of exceptional	circumstances requires	an evaluation of both the	

- 1 - 08CV1016

	Case 3:08-cv-01016-JM-BLM Document 4 Filed 06/19/2008 Page 2 of 2			
1	'likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate [her] claims pro se in			
2	light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.' Neither of these issues is dispositive and both			
3	must be viewed together before reaching a decision." <u>Id.</u> (quoting <u>Wilborn v. Escalderon</u> , 789 F.2d			
4	1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986)).			
5	Here, it appears that plaintiff has a sufficient grasp of his case, the legal issues involved, and			
6	is able to adequately articulate the basis of his complaint. Under these circumstances, the Court denies			
7	plaintiff's request for appointment of counsel because it is not warranted by the interests of justice.			
8	<u>LaMere v. Risley</u> , 827 F.2d 622, 626 (9th Cir. 1987).			
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.			
10	DATED: June 19, 2008			
11	Hop. Jeffrey T. Miller			
12	United States District Judge cc: All parties			
13				
14				
15				
16				
17 18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				

- 2 - 08CV1016